

Serial No. 09/996,184

Reply

Page 5 of 8

REMARKS**Rejection Of Claims Under 35 USC §103(a):**

1. Claims 1-20 are rejected as being allegedly obvious over the teachings of Poff (US 6,123,667). Applicant has amended the independent claims to specify that when the PIP is a hyaluronic acid, the hyaluronic acid has an average molecular weight of about 150KDa or more. Support for this limitation can be found in the specification at least at page 7, lines 2-5, as well as in the examples. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are patentable over the cited art as the Poff reference does not teach or suggest the presently claimed invention with all its limitations.

The teachings of Poff amount to "obvious to try" at most, rather than "obvious to arrive at" the present invention for a person of ordinary skill in the art. Poff generally lists at col. 10 numerous biologically active ingredients to be combined with the article or patch or adhesive, such as hemostatic agents, anti-thrombotic agents, anti-inflammatory agents, etc... which likely encompass thousands of specific agents. However, Poff never provides any specific instruction as to the use of which specific agent in what specific amount and under what specific conditions. Poff is particularly silent as to what type of hyaluronic acid (HA) to use and how to incorporate it into the articles. In particular, Poff does not teach the use of any specific molecular weight of HA to be used, or less "a molecular weight that is about 150KDa or more" such as to increase the viscosity of the mixture to be greater than the sum of the viscosities of the components. It is well known that hyaluronic acid materials vary greatly in their molecular weight depending on their source, mode of extraction, processing or storage conditions. Furthermore, Poff does not suggest a need for increasing the viscosity of macromer solutions, nor is Poff concerned in evaluating the viscoelastic properties of the macromeric solutions.

Therefore, based on the facts of the present case, it is clearly "obvious to try" at most to arrive at the present invention in view of Poff alone.

Accordingly, because the cited art fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention with all its limitations, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.